



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,086	01/23/2001	Douglas Evans McKenzie	5577-228	1434

20792 7590 08/26/2004

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC  
PO BOX 37428  
RALEIGH, NC . 27627

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/768,086

Applicant(s)

MCKENZIE ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20010123</u>  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Detailed Action***

Claims 1-51 are pending in this Office Action.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed on paper filed January 23, 2001 has been considered.

***Preliminary Amendment***

The preliminary amendment received on 1/23/01 has been entered.

***Formal Drawings***

The formal drawings received on 2/12/02 have been entered.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim is dependent upon itself. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-3, 6-7, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc.**

Regarding claim 1, a method of determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses (LeBlanc: col. 15, lines 45-58; col. 1, lines 18-30; col. 3, lines 66- col. 4, line 3; col. 13, ¾ down page... OidDescr IpVlanIpNetAddress and NetMask; IP address), comprising the steps of:

creating an intermediate file that is a representation of the MIB file containing attribute specific information including the SNMP object identifier for each attribute (LeBlanc: col. 1, lines 59-65; col. 3, lines 44-49);

determining all the SNMP object identifiers contained in the intermediate file that identify relevant attribute types (LeBlanc: col. 1, lines 59-65; organizes by OED; col. 2, lines 52-67); and

generating an output file containing the SNMP object identifiers determined to identify the relevant attribute types (LeBlanc: col. 1, lines 59-65).

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1, wherein the relevant attribute types include an IP address type attribute and a table-based attribute that is pointed to by an IP address (LeBlanc: col. 3, lines 66- col. 4, line 3; col. 13, ¾ down page... OidDescr IpVlanIpNetAddress and NetMask; IP address).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 2, wherein the determining step further comprises the steps of:

storing the SNMP object identifiers determined to identify IP address type attributes (LeBlanc: col. 2, lines 37-38); and

storing all attributes contained in a table for table-based attributes that are pointed to by an IP address (LeBlanc: col. 15, lines 45-58); and

determining and storing a start position of the IP address used as a pointer in the SNMP object identifier (LeBlanc: col. 2, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 6, the method of claim 1, wherein the intermediate file further contains:

an indication of whether each attribute is a scalar attribute or a table-based attribute (LeBlanc: col. 15, lines 45-57); and

an indication of the Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1) of each attribute (col. 3, lines 66- col. 4, line 3; col. 13, ¾ down page... OidDescr IpVlanIpNetAddress and IpVlanIpNetMask).

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim 6, wherein the ASN. 1 attribute type is at least one of IpAddress, NetworkAddress, and CiscoNetworkAddress (col. 3, lines 66- col. 4, line 3; col. 13, ¾ down page... OidDescr IpVlanIpNetAddress and IpVlanIpNetMask).

Regarding claim 14, the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of receiving an argument that identifies the MIB file (LeBlanc: col. 5, lines 4-19), wherein the argument is at least one of a single file name and a list of file names (LeBlanc: col. 2, lines 19, 20, lines 52-67).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No 5,651,006 by Fujino et al.**

**Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,337,360 by Fischer.**

**Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,337,360 by Fischer.**

**Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of Network Working Group RFC 2578, April 1999 by McCloghrie et al.**

**Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Publication 2001/0052006 by Barker et al.**

**Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,397 by Sheppard.**

**Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 by Ellis.**

Regarding claim 4,

The LeBlanc reference teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the step of determining and storing the start position further comprises the steps of:

determining the start position of each of the plurality of IP addresses in the SNMP object identifier of the table-based attribute (LeBlanc: col. 2, lines 60-67; col. 9 2/3 down page, SysObjectID... with addresses; grammars and tokens).

The LeBlanc reference does not explicitly state a table-based attribute is pointed to by IP addresses.

The Fujino reference teaches determining if a table-based attribute is pointed to by a plurality of IP addresses (Fujino: col. 9, lines 25-48); and

The Fujino reference further teaches the system manages a large-scale communications network with low traffic and at low cost (Fujino: col. 2, lines 54-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses as taught by LeBlanc while employing table-based attributes as taught by Fujino

in order to manage the communications network with low traffic and at low cost (Fujino: col. 2, lines 54-59).

Claim 5 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of LeBlanc and Fujino et al.

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 4 further comprising the step of identifying errors in the stored SNMP object identifier and table-based attributes, so as to not create the output file if errors are identified (Fujino: col. 16, lines 17-29).

Regarding claim 8,

The LeBlanc reference teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of generating an output file comprises the steps of:

storing a list of all object identifiers that identify IP address type attributes in the output file (LeBlanc: col. 2, lines 37-38);

storing an indication of a start position of an IP address used as a pointer to a table-based attribute in a corresponding SNMP object identifier in the output file (LeBlanc: col. 2, lines 60-67).

LeBlanc does not explicitly state storing an indication to be translated.

The Fischer reference teaches storing an indication of a need to be translated (Fischer: col. 21, lines 3-11).

The Fischer reference further teaches a program that is flexible and can be used to validate input, allows parse and incorporate data to regulate the future transmission (Fischer: col. 2, lines 18-43; col. 3, lines 20-25).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses as taught by LeBlanc while employing an indication of a need to be translated as taught by Fischer in order to flexibly validate input, parse and incorporate data to regulate the future transmission (Fischer: col. 2, lines 18-43; col. 3, lines 20-25).

Regarding claim 9,

The LeBlanc and Fischer references teach the method of claim 8, wherein the step of storing an indication of a start position comprises storing an indication of a start position for each IP address in a corresponding SNMP object identifier in the output file (LeBlanc: col. 2, lines 60-67; col. 9 2/3 down page, SysObjectID... with addresses).

The LeBlanc and Fischer references do not explicitly state a table-based attribute pointed to by IP addresses.

The Fujino reference teaches wherein the table-based attribute is pointed to by a plurality of IP addresses (Fujino: col. 9, lines 25-51).

The Fujino reference further teaches the system manages a large-scale communications network with low traffic and at low cost (Fujino: col. 2, lines 54-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses as taught by LeBlanc and Fischer while employing table-based attributes as taught by Fujino in order to manage the communications network with low traffic and at low cost (Fujino: col. 2, lines 54-59).

Claim 10 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of LeBlanc, Fischer, and Fujino et al.

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 9, wherein the plurality of IP addresses comprises at most four IP addresses (Fujino: col. 7, lines 2-12; a limit placed on the range).

Regarding claim 11,

The LeBlanc reference teaches the method of claim 1, with MIB files and SNMP communication.

The LeBlanc reference does not explicitly state the MIB file is SMI version 1.



The RFC 2578 teaches a MIB file is a Structure of Management Information (SMI) version 1 style MIB file (K. McCloghrie: Page 4, 1.1 A note on Terminology, old version is SMIv1).

The RFC 2578 further teaches SMI is an adapted subset that further define modules related to MIB data and module identity (McCloghrie: col. page 2, Introduction).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses as taught by LeBlanc while employing SMI version 1 as taught by RFC 2578 in order to adapt the Managed Information Base to further define the modules related to the MIB data and identity (McCloghrie: col. page 2, Introduction).

Claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of LeBlanc and the RFC.

Regarding claim 12, the method of claim 1, wherein the MIB file is a Structure of Management Information (SMI) version 2 style MIB file (K. McCloghrie: Page 4, 1.1 A note on Terminology, current version is SMIv2).

Regarding claim 13,

The LeBlanc reference teaches the method of claim 1, determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses with attributes.

The LeBlanc reference does not explicitly state packets with attributes.

The Barker reference teaches wherein the attributes are located in an SNMP data packet (Barker: page 19, para 493-496).

The Barker reference further teaches the invention overcomes deficiencies of known network element management systems and provides distributed network management for enhanced efficiency and convenience (Barker: page 1, para 9).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses as taught by LeBlanc while employing the attributes located in SNMP data packets as taught by Barker in order to overcome deficiencies of known network element management systems and provides distributed network management for enhanced efficiency and convenience (Barker: page 1, para 9).

Regarding claim 15,

The LeBlanc reference teaches the method of claim 14 wherein the step of receiving an argument further comprises

wherein the step of creating an intermediate file comprises creating an intermediate file containing attribute specific information of all files in the list of file names if the argument is a list of file names (LeBlanc: col. 1, lines 59-65).

The LeBlanc does not explicitly state a list of file names.

The Sheppard reference teaches the step of determining if the argument is a list of file names (Sheppard: col. 22, lines 37-43).

The Sheppard reference further teaches the invention is useful for analyzing a data files containing a plurality of data records with each data record containing a plurality of parameters while making efficient use of the tremendous amount of information (Sheppard: col. 1, lines 17-18, lines 35-43).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses as taught by LeBlanc while employing lists of file arguments as taught by Sheppard in order to analyze the data files containing a plurality of data records with each data record containing a plurality of parameters while making efficient use of the tremendous amount of information (Sheppard: col. 1, lines 17-18, lines 35-43).

Claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of LeBlanc and the RFC.

Regarding claim 16, the method of claim 15, wherein the list of file names comprises at least one of a plurality of single file names or a plurality of lists of file names (Sheppard: col. 22, lines 37-43; Figure 18, list of filenames).

Regarding claim 17,

The LeBlanc reference teaches the method of claim 1, with an output file.

The LeBlanc reference says the output file is translated for an interface but does not explicitly state NAT.

The Ellis reference teaches an output file is consumable by a Comprehensive Network Address Translator (CNAT) product (Ellis: col. 5, lines 6-9; col. 6, lines 14-25).

The Ellis reference further teaches the invention offers scaleable end to end transmission in a distributed network while increasing processing power which eliminates latency as bandwidth increases (Ellis: col. 4, lines 40-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of determining Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) object identifiers in a Management Information Base (MIB) file that identify Internet Protocol (IP) addresses as taught by LeBlanc while employing loading a file for NAT as taught by Ellis in order to offer scaleable end to end transmission in a distributed network while increasing processing power which eliminates latency as bandwidth increases (Ellis: col. 4, lines 40-65).

While the examiner acknowledges the differences between a method, a system and a computer program product, the examiner equates a system to the hardware in which the

computer program product which is the code implements the method. Because the limitations are similar they are rejected under the same rationale as indicated in the table below.

1	18	35
2	19	36
3	20	37
4	21	38
5	22	39
6	23	40
7	24	41
8	25	42
9	26	43
10	27	44
11	28	45
12	29	46
13	30	47
14	31	48
15	32	49
16	33	50
17	34	51

**Claims 18-20, 23-24, 35-37, 40-41, 31, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc.**

**Claims 21-22, 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No 5,651,006 by Fujino et al.**

**Claim 25, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,337,360 by Fischer.**

**Claims 26-27, 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,337,360 by Fischer.**

**Claims 28-29, 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of Network Working Group RFC 2578, April 1999 by McCloghrie et al.**

**Claim 30, 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Publication 2001/0052006 by Barker et al.**

**Claims 32-33, 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,397 by Sheppard.**

**Claim 34, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,142 issued to LeBlanc in view of U.S. Patent No 6,484,257 by Ellis.**

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2155  
brb  
August 19, 2004

BRB



**HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**